

No.: 6,487,424), hereinafter referred to as Kraft. Claims 2, 3, 9, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kotola in view of Kraft, and Tuoriniemi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,470,197), hereinafter referred to as Tuoriniemi. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kotola and Kraft, and further in view of Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,966,671), hereinafter referred to as Mitchell.¹

§ 103(a) Rejections (Kotola / Kraft) - Claims 4, 8, 10, 11, and 14

Claims 4, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected over Kotola and Kraft for essentially the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action, and the Examiner adds new arguments in the *Response to Arguments* section of the present Office Action. The Examiner also adds arguments to support the rejection of claim 14, which was added in the previous Amendment.

With respect to claim 4, in the previous Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Kotola satisfied “interpreting data inputted through the internet and displaying the inputted data on a screen,” which was previously recited in claim 4. In the last Amendment, the foregoing quoted limitation was changed, for clarification purposes, to recite, “interpreting data inputted through the internet and displaying the inputted data on a screen of the wireless internet access terminal, said data including plural objects that are each linked to predetermined resource location information,” (emphasis added) and it was argued that Kotola does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 4. In the present Office Action, the Examiner maintains that the limitation, even as clarified, is taught by Kotola. To support this particular argument, the Examiner cites the same portions of Kotola as set forth in the previous Office Action, except the Examiner also cites col. 3, lines 17-32 (lines 17-23 were not previously cited), and col. 7, lines 4-14, which

¹ Kotola, Kraft, and Mitchell were applied previously.

were not previously cited, to support the allegation that the above-quoted limitation is satisfied.

In sub-section (1) of *Response to Arguments* section, the Examiner merely repeats the arguments set forth on 3 of the Office Action.

In response, Applicant maintains the previously submitted arguments. That is, in summary, Applicant maintains that sending an SMS message that includes a short keyword that is later mapped to a URL when the SMS message is processed at a short message service center (as described in Kotola), does not correspond to displaying objects that are linked to URLs on a screen of the wireless internet access terminal, wherein the objects can be focused and have plural execution items associated therewith (as previously argued). The new portions of Kotola cited by the Examiner support the same understanding of Kotola, as described above and in the previous Amendment.

Furthermore, Applicant maintains that, in Kotola, the information that is returned in response to the SMS request for a WWW page and then displayed is merely a text message, *i.e.*, SMS message (Kotola: col. 8, lines 1-3). *See also previous Amendment.* Therefore, at least because the information that is returned in Kotola is merely a text message, Applicant submits that the data inputted through the internet does NOT include plural objects that are each linked to predetermined resource location (URL) information. That is, there are no links between the text message of Kotola and predetermined resource location (URL) information.

Yet further, with respect to claim 4, it was argued in the previous Amendment that neither Kotola nor Kraft teaches or suggests at least “displaying plural execution items sequentially one by one by displaying one of the plural execution items of the focused object on one screen and executing an execution item displayed on the present screen by inputs from a button,” as recited in claim 4. The Examiner acknowledges that Kotola fails to teach or suggest

this feature of claim 4, and, in the previous Amendment, arguments were made regarding why Kraft does not disclose the limitations quoted above in this paragraph. Applicant maintains those same arguments submitted in the previous Amendment, and points out that the Examiner does not respond to the particular arguments made in the previous Amendment relating to the limitation quoted in this paragraph. In sub-section (3) of the *Response to Arguments* section, the Examiner simply repeats the same arguments set forth on page 3 of the Office Action, which were also asserted in the previous Office Action.

Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant maintains that the present invention, as recited in claim 4, is patentably distinguishable over Kotola and Kraft, either alone or in combination. Applicant maintains that claims 8, 10-11, and 14 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 4, either indirectly or directly.

§ 103(a) Rejections (Kotola / Kraft / Tuoriniemi) - Claims 2, 3, 9, 12, and 13

Claims 2, 3, 9, 12, and 13 are rejected over Kotola in view of Kraft and Tuoriniemi for the reasons set forth on pages 5-9 of the present Office Action.

As set forth above, and in the previous Amendment, claim 2 is patentable for reasons similar to those set forth for claim 4. Therefore, Applicant maintains that claim 2 is patentable over the applied references at least because the applied references do not teach or suggest at least “interpreting data inputted through the internet and displaying the inputted data on a screen of the wireless internet access terminal, said data including plural objects that are each linked to predetermined resource location information,” “focusing any one of plural the objects displayed on a the screen and each linked to predetermined resource access location information,” and “selecting and executing any one of various execution items of the focused object according to

an input state of a single button," as recited in claim 2, and similarly recited in claim 4.

Tuoriniemi does not make up for the deficiencies of Kotola and Kraft.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 3, 9, 12, and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective indirect or direct dependencies from independent claims 2 and 4.

§ 103(a) Rejections (Kotola / Kraft / Mitchell) - Claims 5-7

The Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 5-7 over Kotola, Kraft, and Mitchell. Applicant maintains that claims 5-7 are patentable at least by virtue of their indirect or direct dependency from independent claim 4. Mitchell does not make up for the deficiencies of Kotola and Kraft.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 11, 2004